But there is another level in this debate. Even if Congress enacts health-care reform and even if communities start to deal with this escalating problem, as a country we are still faced with a whole host of problems that we are only beginning to comprehend. For instance, we now have to ask about the responsibility of the healthcare community to provide leadership for community collaboration. And how should the role of healthcare providers intersect with others in the community?

Furthermore, the provider is now confronted with serious ethical questions such as whether physicians should be mandated to report information about abuse and if so, to whom? Is the obligation to notify the law enforcement or legal systems greater than the responsibility to respect the victim's autonomy? If a victim asks that there be no action, should a doctor or nurse or therapist honor the request? And what are the responsibilities of health professionals with regard to the perpetrators? What is the role of neighbors who hear much too much through thin walls?

I don't have all the answers to these types of questions. Indeed, since we have just opened the door to this discussion, I'm not sure anyone does. But that, in part, is the point. We have now initiated this debate, and we have begun talking as a community—knowing full well that because of this conversation we will begin solving one of the most devastating social and medical problems facing every one of us.

For the last two years, my wife Shelia and I have been traveling throughout Minnesota, convening gatherings and attending events where such issues are being discussed. The conversations are having an impact. We are seeing community action throughout the state, and we are seeing a tremendous number of providers, judges, and police getting involved. My own experience in Minnesota makes me believe that similar efforts nationwide will also be successful.

We must begin this discussion with a sense of urgency—peoples' lives and safety are at stake.●

ON ECONOMIST ARTICLE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, a few months ago, we passed the dubious milestone of having 1 million inmates serving time in prison. That number is expected to soar further as Congress and the States respond to the public's fear of crime by enacting longer prison terms for drug offenders and other criminals.

Before we head full-steam down this prison-building path, I think we need to consider carefully whether we are being smart about how we punish criminals. Last year, I asked my staff to survey prison wardens around the Nation for their views on our crime policies. The results were surprising. Only 39 percent recommended building more prisons. But 65 percent said we should use our existing prison space more efficiently, by imposing shorter sentences on nonviolent offenders, and longer prison terms on violent ones.

A few States, such as Florida and Georgia, have begun to respond in this way. They have begun to look at innovative ways to free up prison space by sentencing nonviolent criminals to ''intermediate sanctions,'' such as home detention and work release. As a recent article in the Economist noted, these programs are highly cost-efficient. In Florida, for example, these alternative programs cost only $6.49 per day per felon, compared with nearly $40 per day for prison.

And, the programs don't compromise public safety. As the Economist reported, ''A 6 year survey by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency shows that in Florida, people sentenced to such penalties are less likely to be arrested within 18 months of their release than similar offenders who had been sentenced to between 12 and 30 months in jail.''

That is what I call being both tough on crime and smart. It is an approach Congress should consider before it spends billions more on another incarceration binge. I ask that the full text of the Economist article be reprinted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Economist, Nov. 19, 1994]

ALTERNATIVES TO PRISON—CHEAPER IS BETTER

RICHMOND, VA.—Self-preservation requires American politicans to be slap-'em-inside tough on crime these days. The argument for toughness stands on uncertain ground: the number of Americans in prison has more than doubled since 1982, now standing at over 1m, and yet notified violent crime has risen by two-fifths, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Still, the voters want to lock the villains up, and the politicans reckon they had better get on with it. The next question is how much it will cost the taxpayer.

In Virginia, whose capital has the country's second-highest homicide rate, the General Assembly recently met in extraordinary session to lengthen prison terms for violent criminals and—like 13 other states and the federal government—to abolish discretionary parole for newly convicted felons. That needs nearly 30 new prisons. Some say this could cost $2 billion. The new Republican governor, George Allen, says that the true cost is closer to $1 billion, and that the state's prison population would anyway have doubled, without the new measures, by 2005.

But the Democrats who control the legislature balked even at that figure, and have given Mr. Allen only about $40m to erect a handful of the work camps needed to accommodate the queue of prisoners waiting for space in the local jails. Mr. Allen, who has promised not to raise taxes, will have to go back to the Assembly next year and try to find the rest of the $370m that he describes as a down-payment for safer streets. It costs $19,800 a year to keep an inmate behind bars. It is doubtful whether the governor can raise what he needs by cutting expenditure elsewhere and selling off surplus state properties. Many state agencies are still operating on recession budgets. The sale of state land and equipment is expected to net a paltry $26m.

On the other side of the country, in Oregon, where parole was abolished in 1989, a cheaper way of coping with over-full prisons is being tried. Oregon's voters are not keen on paying more, either: the advocates of tougher penalties for crimes against property failed to get enough signatures to put their proposal on the ballot last year, presumably because it would have cost $300m a year. So the state legislature, in providing more money for the corrections department, said that most of it should go into alternatives to prison for non-violent offenders. That would free some existing prison space for more dangerous criminals.

This approach has already been tried in states with some of the highest incarceration rates in the nation, among them Florida and Georgia. So-called ''intermediate sanctions'' for non-violent felons—for instance, house arrest or work programmes—are cheap. In Florida, they cost only $6.49 per day per felon, compared with prison's near-$40 a day. They may also be working. A six-year study by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency shows that in Florida people sentenced to such penalties are less likely to be arrested within 18 months of their release than similar offenders who had been sentenced to between 12 and 30 months in jail.

Texas, though, stays old-fashioned about its prison problem: it throws money at it. Twice this year, the Texas legislature has taken $100m from other parts of the state government to pay for more prisons. The voters, who rejected a $750m bond issue for schools, backed $1 billion for the Corrections Department. The trouble is that new parole restrictions look like further increasing the demand for Texan prison space. In the Lone Star state, getting into prison may prove tougher than getting out of it.●

ON PRISON WARDEN SURVEY

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, there has been much talk recently about rewriting last year's Federal crime bill. That talk has focused on spending billions more for prison construction and longer sentences, while drastically reducing funds for prevention programs.

I urge my colleagues to think hard about whether these changes represent smart policy. Last month, I conducted a survey of 157 wardens, and I asked them to comment on our present crime policies. By large margins, the wardens warned that our overwhelming emphasis on building prisons just isn't working. They urged a far more balanced approach to crime-fighting, that mixes punishment, prevention, and treatment.

The Daily Southtown, in a recent editorial, called on Congress to listen to the advice of these experts, rather than moving rapidly ahead with policies that may be politically popular, but ultimately shortsighted. That is a message we would all do well to heed.

I ask that this editorial be reprinted following my remarks.

The editorial follows:

[From the Daily Southtown, Dec. 8, 1994]

WARDENS' VIEW ON CRIME: MANDATORY SENTENCING WON'T SOLVE PROBLEM

Is ''locking them up and throwing away the key'' the most effective approach to reducing crime? Not if you listen to the prison wardens across the country who are in charge of the nation's inmates.

Some 157 prison wardens were surveyed by a U.S. Senate subcommittee, and 85 percent of them said the politically popular approach—mandatory, longer incarceration—didn't work.

The survey was conducted at the request of Sen. Paul Simon (D–Ill.). The survey showed that ''the idea we can solve our crime problem by putting more people in prison just has not worked,'' Simon said. The senator said most of the wardens favored approaches